

REMARKS

Claims 6-25 are pending in the application.

TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

Applicant thanks the Examiner, Kerri M. Rose, for the courtesies extended to Applicant's attorney, Karl F. Horlander, Reg. No. 63,147, in a telephonic interview conducted on February 27, 2009. In the telephonic interview, the parties discussed U.S. Patent No. 6,453,369 to Imamura et al., (hereinafter "Imamura"), with respect to the independent claims, in light of the Office Action mailed December 9, 2008. In view of the discussion, the Examiner now agrees that U.S. Patent No. 6,826,690 to Hind et al., (hereinafter "Hind"), as modified by Imamura fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the independent Claims 6, 14, and 19.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

The Office Action, on page 2, rejected Claims 6-25 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hind in view of Imamura.

Claim 6

As discussed in the telephonic interview, the combination of Hind modified by Imamura fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claim 6. For example, the recited combination fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "in response to a request from the first program executed on the processor to access the data associated with the second program, the processor further configured to determine whether the first communication address matches the second communication address."

As agreed to in the telephonic interview, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case for obviousness of Claim 6 and the claims dependent thereupon. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections of Claim 6 and the claims dependent thereupon.

Claim 14

As discussed in the telephonic interview, the combination of Hind modified by Imamura fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claim 14. For example, the recited combination fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "in response to the request for the first program to access the data associated with the second program, the processor determining whether the first provider identifier of the first program matches the second provider identifier associated with the second program."

As agreed to in the telephonic interview, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case for obviousness of Claim 14 and the claims dependent thereupon. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections of Claim 14 and the claims dependent thereupon.

Claim 19

As discussed in the telephonic interview, the combination of Hind modified by Imamura fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claim 19. For example, the recited combination fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "computer code stored on the computer readable memory, the computer code executable on the processor, in response to a request to allow the first program to access data stored in the memory, wherein the data is associated with a second program, to determine whether the first communication address associated with the first program matches a second communication address associated with the second program."

As agreed to in the telephonic interview, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case for obviousness of Claim 19 and the claims dependent thereupon. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections of Claim 19 and the claims dependent thereupon.

Response to Final Office Action Mailed December 9, 2008

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes the application to be in condition for allowance, which Applicant earnestly requests. Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney for the Applicant via telephone if such communication would expedite examination or allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 4, 2009

/Karl F. Horlander/

Karl F. Horlander, Reg. No. 63,147
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
Customer No. 27879
(317) 636-0886